



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,403	07/28/2003	Qiong Liu	FXPL-01063US0	7211
23910	7590	11/12/2008	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108				STOKELY-COLLINS, JASMINE N
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2423				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/12/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/629,403	LIU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jasmine Stokely-Collins	4178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/2004</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 10, in the last line, limitation "the physical device" is unclear.

Applicant refers to two physical devices in claim 10 and it is unclear which physical device applicant is referring to.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3. Claim 36 claims a computer data signal, which is functional descriptive material per-se. The claim does not define a tangible computer- readable medium on which the program is recorded (i.e. "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized").

A signal is neither a process ("actions"), nor machine, nor manufacture, nor composition of matter (i.e. a tangible "thing") and therefore does not fall within one of the four statutory categories of § 101.

Because the full scope of the claim as properly read in light of the disclosure encompasses non-statutory subject matter, the claim as a whole is non-statutory, under the present USPTO Interim Guidelines, 1300 Official Gazette Patent and Trademark Office 142 (Nov. 22, 2005).

4. Claims 37-45 claim a machine readable medium embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claim does not define a computer-readable medium to be a memory/disk and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e. "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized").

However, the specification (at page 14, section 0043...) indicates "the storage medium can include, but is not limited to...", and therefore does not disqualify non-tangible storage mediums (e.g. carrier waves, infrared signals, digital signals, etc.) that data may be formatted (stored within the communication/transport medium, i.e. signal) for broadcasting.

A "signal" embodying functional descriptive material is neither a process ("actions"), nor machine, nor manufacture, nor composition of matter (i.e. a tangible "thing") and therefore does not fall within one of the four statutory categories of § 101. Rather, "signal" is a form of energy, in the absence of any physical structure or tangible material.

Because the full scope of the claims as properly read in light of the disclosure encompasses non-statutory subject matter, the claim as a whole is non-statutory, under the present USPTO Interim Guidelines, 1300 Official Gazette Patent and Trademark Office 142 (Nov. 22, 2005).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15, 9-14, 16-17, and 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al (US 7,185,054 B1) in view of Okuno (US 6,977,672 B1) and further in view of Saka (US 2004/0070608 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Ludwig teaches a method for exchanging information in a shared interactive environment (abstract) comprising:  
a first live video image and a second live video image (figure 40 element 203 shows multiple live video images)

Ludwig does not teach selecting a first physical device in a first live video image wherein the first physical device has information associated with it; causing the information to be transferred to a second physical device in a second live video image wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual

representation of the information;  
wherein the manipulation includes interacting with the first live video image and the second live video image;  
wherein the first physical device and the second physical device are part of the shared interactive environment; and  
wherein the first physical device and the second physical device are not the same.

Okuno teaches an interactive environment that includes selecting a first physical device in a first live video image wherein the first physical device has information associated with it (figure 17 and column 4 lines 23-32, figure 18 and column 4 lines 35-41, figure 19 and column 4 lines 45-52,);  
wherein manipulation includes interacting with the live video images (column 4 lines 38-41, figure 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Okuno's teaching of using remote camera control and a live video image of a device in order to remotely manipulate/interact with said device with Ludwig's videoconferencing invention for the benefit of allowing video conference participants to control computers, printers, and other commonly used conference devices that are not physically reachable.

Ludwig in view of Okuno does not teach causing the information to be transferred to a second physical device in a second live video image wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual representation of the

information;

wherein the first physical device and the second physical device are part of the shared interactive environment; and

wherein the first physical device and the second physical device are not the same.

Saka teaches causing information to be transferred to a second physical device wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual representation of the information (page 1 section 0011);

wherein the first physical device and the second physical device are part of the shared interactive environment (page 1 section 0011); and

wherein the first physical device and the second physical device are not the same (page 1 section 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the information transfer interface taught by Saka in the videoconferencing with remote control of devices taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno for the benefit of providing videoconference participants with a convenient and simple (for participants) method of sharing information. For example, the action of sending data to the printer disclosed in Okuno (figure 10 shows an interface for controlling the printer, where the structure of the commands to carry out the actions are shown in figure 9 list element 7 and figure 5) from a computer as disclosed in Saka would be carried out using Saka's "drag and drop" method. Alternatively, Okuno's printer could be replaced with one of Saka's remote machines so that control of the multiple

computers disclosed in Saka's network could be initiated by the live video image manipulation taught by Okuno.

Regarding claim 2, when read in light of claim 1, Saka further teaches the manipulation is accomplished by dragging the representation from the first physical device and dropping the representation on the second physical device (abstract).

Regarding claim 3, when read in light of claim 1, limitation "changes to the physical devices are visible to all participants in the shared interactive environment" is inherent. If all participants in the videoconference have the capabilities disclosed in Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka, all participants would have the ability to focus on any physical device and obtain current associated information, which would reflect any changes.

Regarding claim 4, when read in light of claim 1, Okuno further teaches a physical device can include a printer (figure 18). In regards to limitation "a physical device can include a display, a projector, a facsimile machine, a personal digital assistant, a computer, and a portable computer", Okuno further discloses in column 5 lines 58-64 that commands can be executed on devices with addresses, such as IP addresses . It is well known in the art that displays,

projectors, facsimile machines, personal digital assistants, computers, and portable computers can have IP addresses associated with them.

Regarding claim 5, when read in light of claim 1, Ludwig further teaches annotating at least one of the first live video image and the second live video image (fig 2b, col. 6 ll. 57-61. Updates/annotations are made to the image in real time).

Regarding claim 9, when read in light of claim 1, Okuno further teaches at least one of the first physical device and the second physical device has associated with it a pop-up control panel through which a user can configure and control it (figure 18, column 4 lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 10, Ludwig teaches a method for exchanging information in a shared interactive environment (abstract), comprising:  
a first live video image and a second live video image (figure 40 element 203 shows multiple live video images).

Ludwig does not teach selecting a first object wherein the first object is one of: 1) a physical device in a first live video image; and 2) an icon on a computing device;  
causing information associated with the first object to be transferred to a second object wherein the second object is the other of: 1) a physical device in a first live

video image; and 3) an icon on a computing device;  
wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual representation of  
the information;  
wherein the manipulation includes interacting with the first object and the second  
object; and  
wherein the physical device is part of the shared interactive environment.

Okuno teaches selecting a first object wherein the first object is one of: 1)  
a physical device in a first live video image (figure 17 and column 4 lines 23-32,  
figure 18 and column 4 lines 35-41, figure 19 and column 4 lines 45-52); and 2)  
an icon on a computing device;  
wherein the manipulation includes interacting with the object in the live video  
(column 4 lines 38-41, figure 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary  
skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Okuno's teaching  
of using remote camera control and a live video image of a device in order to  
remotely manipulate/interact with said device with Ludwig's videoconferencing  
invention for the benefit of allowing video conference participants to control  
computers, printers, and other commonly used conference devices that are not  
physically reachable.

Ludwig in view of Okuno does not teach causing information associated  
with the first object to be transferred to a second object wherein the second  
object is the other of: 1) a physical device in a first live video image; and 3) an  
icon on a computing device;

wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual representation of the information;

wherein the manipulation includes interacting with the first object and the second object; and

wherein the physical device is part of the shared interactive environment.

Saka teaches causing information associated with the first object to be transferred to a second object wherein the second object is the other of: 1) a physical device in a first live video image; and 3) an icon on a computing device (page 1 section 0011);

wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual representation of the information (page 1 section 0011);

wherein the manipulation includes interacting with the first object and the second object (page 1 section 0011); and

wherein the physical device is part of the shared interactive environment (page 1 section 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the information transfer interface taught by Saka in the videoconferencing with remote control of devices taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno for the benefit of providing videoconference participants with a convenient and simple (for participants) method of sharing information. For example, the action of sending data to the printer disclosed in Okuno (figure 10 shows an interface for controlling the printer, where the structure of the commands to carry out the actions are shown in figure 9 list element 7 and figure

5) from a computer as disclosed in Saka would be carried out using Saka's "drag and drop" method. Alternatively, Okuno's printer could be replaced with one of Saka's remote machines so that control of the multiple computers disclosed in Saka's network could be initiated by the live video image manipulation taught by Okuno.

Regarding claim 11, when read in light of claim 10, Saka further teaches the manipulation is accomplished by dragging the representation from the first object and dropping the representation on the second object (abstract).

Regarding claim 12, when read in light of claim 10, limitation "changes to the physical device are visible to all participants in the shared interactive environment" is inherent. If all participants in the videoconference have the capabilities disclosed in Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka, all participants would have the ability to focus on any physical device and obtain current associated information, which would reflect any changes.

Regarding claim 13, when read in light of claim 10, Okuno further teaches a physical device can include a printer (figure 18). In regards to limitation "a physical device can include a display, a projector, a facsimile machine, a personal digital assistant, a computer, and a portable computer", Okuno further discloses in column 5 lines 58-64 that commands can be executed on devices

with addresses, such as IP addresses . It is well known in the art that displays, projectors, facsimile machines, personal digital assistants, computers, and portable computers can have IP addresses associated with them.

Regarding claim 14, when read in light of claim 1, Ludwig further teaches annotating the first live video image (fig 2b, col. 6 ll. 57-61. Updates/annotations are made to the image in real time).

Regarding claim 16, when read in light of claim 10, Okuno further teaches the information can include a digital file (column 4 lines 25-29), a sound (column 4 lines 29-32), and an audio/video presentation (column 4 lines 29-32).

Regarding claim 17, when read in light of claim 10, Okuno further teaches the physical device has associated with it a pop-up control panel through which a user can configure and control it (figure 18, column 4 lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 36, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions (i.e. a computer data signal), therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 1 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 1).

Regarding claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 10 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 10).

Regarding claim 38, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 11 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 11).

Regarding claim 39, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 12 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 12).

Regarding claim 40, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 13 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 13).

Regarding claim 41, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 14 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 14).

Regarding claim 42, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 15 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 15).

Regarding claim 43, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 10 with the additional limitation of claim 7 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claims 10 and 7).

Regarding claim 44, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the

method described in claim 16 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 16).

Regarding claim 45, when read in light of claim 37, Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, which inherently requires machine readable instructions, therefore a computer data signal embodying the method described in claim 17 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 17).

Regarding claim 46 Ludwig, Okuno, and Saka all implement their inventions in hardware, and therefore teach a system with means for carrying out the method described in claim 1 is taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka (see analysis of claim 1).

7. Claims 6, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al (US 7,185,054 B1) in view of Okuno (US 6,977,672 B1) and Saka (US 2004/0070608 A1), and further in view of Shneiderman (US 7,010,751 B2).

Regarding claim 6, when read in light of claim 5, Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka teaches the method of claim 5.

Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka does not teach automatically transferring the annotation to a physical device if the annotation is at least partially drawn over the physical device as it appears in a live video image.

Shneiderman teaches automatically transferring the annotation to an “image aspect” (a physical device would qualify as an image aspect, col. 7 ll. 23-25) in an image if the annotation is at least partially drawn over the physical device as it appears in a live video image (col. 7 ll. 29-32, col. 4 ll. 27-29, see fig. 5 annotation of Rae Earnshaw). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to annotate aspects of images for the benefit of making annotations more specific to certain attributes of an image rather than the entire image.

Regarding claim 8, Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka further teaches the information can include a digital file (Okuno column 4 lines 25-29), a sound (Okuno column 4 lines 29-32), and an audio/video presentation (Okuno column 4 lines 29-32).

Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka does not teach the information can include an annotation.

Shneiderman teaches the information can include an annotation (page 3 section 0055-0056). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to annotate aspects of images for the benefit of making annotations more specific to certain attributes of an image rather than the entire image.

Regarding claim 15, Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka teaches the method of claim 14.

Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka does not teach automatically transferring the annotation to the physical device if the annotation is at least partially drawn over the physical device as it appears in a live video image.

Shneiderman teaches automatically transferring the annotation to an “image aspect” (a physical device would qualify as an image aspect, col. 7 ll. 23-25) in an image if the annotation is at least partially drawn over the physical device as it appears in a live video image (col. 7 ll. 29-32, col. 4 ll. 27-29, see fig. 5 annotation of Rae Earnshaw). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to annotate aspects of images for the benefit of making annotations more specific to certain attributes of an image rather than the entire image.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al (US 7,185,054 B1) in view of Okuno (US 6,977,672 B1) and Saka (US 2004/0070608 A1), and further in view of Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1).

Regarding claim 7, when read in light of claim 1, Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka teach the method of claim 1.

Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka does not teach that the first live video image and the second live video image are the same.

Limitation “the first live video image and the second live video image are the same”, in light of claim 1 limitation ”selecting a first physical device in a first live video image ...; causing the information to be transferred to a second physical device in a second live video image wherein the transfer is brought about by manipulating a visual representation of the information” is taught by Emens column 1 lines 57-60 and figure 2c, in which a user can select a device to control amongst a plurality of devices in a single live image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Emen’s teaching of being able to select a device to remotely control from a plurality of devices in a single live image with the invention taught by Ludwig in view of Okuno and Saka. This combination of inventive ideas would enable videoconference participants to remotely control devices in a room without adjusting the camera angle to zoom in on each device.

9. Claims 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al (US 7,185,054 B1) in view of Shneiderman (US 7,010,751 B2).

Regarding claim 18, Ludwig teaches a method for annotating a live video image wherein the annotation is visible to at least one participant in a shared interactive

environment (fig 2b, col. 6 ll. 57-61. Updates/annotations are made to the image in real time).

Ludwig does not teach annotating the live video image and automatically transferring the annotation to a physical device if the annotation is at least partially drawn over the physical device as it appears in a live video image.

Shneiderman teaches a method for annotating video image comprising annotating the live video image and automatically transferring the annotation to a physical device if the annotation is at least partially drawn over the physical device as it appears in a live video image (col. 7 ll. 29-32, col. 4 ll. 27-29, see fig. 5 annotation of Rae Earnshaw). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the annotation capabilities of Shneiderman in the videoconferencing system and method taught by Ludwig for the benefit of easily and clearly communicating information about image aspects in a videoconferencing image to other participants.

Regarding claim 21, when read in light of claim 18, Ludwig in view of Shneiderman teaches the method of claim 18.

Ludwig in view of Shneiderman does not teach the live video image is one of: a panoramic view and a zoomed view.

Official notice is taken that panning and zooming are well known and widely used tools in video surveillance and conferencing systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to include panning and zooming capabilities in the videoconferencing system taught by Ludwig in view of Shneiderman for the benefit of allowing videoconference participants to have access to view of any resources in the collective rooms, such as whiteboards or illustrative models.

10. Claims 19-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al (US 7,185,054 B1) in view of Shneiderman (US 7,010,751 B2), and further in view of Okuno (US 6,977,672 B1).

Regarding claim 19, when read in light of claim 18, Ludwig in view of Shneiderman teaches the method of claim 18.

Ludwig in view of Shneiderman does not teach at least one participant can interact with the physical device.

Okuno teaches an video in which a viewed physical devices can be controlled remotely by a participant (column 4 lines 38-41, figure 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Okuno's teaching of using remote camera control and a live video image of a device in order to remotely manipulate/interact with devices that are not physically reachable.

Regarding claim 20, when read in light of claim 18, Ludwig further teaches each of the at least one participants can interact with the shared interactive environment through different computing devices (col. 6 ll. 28-51).

Regarding claim 22, when read in light of claim 18, Ludwig in view of Shneiderman and Okuno further teaches the physical device can include a display, a projector, a printer, a facsimile machine, a personal digital assistant, a computer, and a portable computer. Okuno discloses in column 5 lines 58-64 that commands can be executed on devices with addresses, such as IP addresses. It is well known in the art that displays, projectors, facsimile machines, personal digital assistants, computers, and portable computers can have IP addresses associated with them.

Regarding claim 23, when read in light of claim 18, Ludwig in view of Shneiderman and Okuno further teaches the physical device has associated with it a pop-up control panel through which a user can configure and control it (Okuno figure 18, column 4 lines 38-41).

11. Claims 24, 26-27, 30, 32, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1) in view of Ayatsuka et al (US 7,188,139 B1), and further in view of Burt et al. "Object tracking with a moving camera", IEEE An Application of Dynamic Motion Analysis. 1989 pp. 2-12.

Regarding claim 24, Emens teaches a shared interactive environment, comprising:

a camera system to provide a first live view and second live view (col. 3 ll. 8-9, where the first live view and second live view are the same in this instance);  
a first graphical user interface (GUI) coupled to the camera system and to present the first live view and the second live view, wherein the views can capture a physical device (abstract);  
a device controller to dynamically control the physical device in response to interaction of a first user with the GUI (fig. 2e, col. 3 ll. 10-11).

Emens does not teach the second live view can be configured to zoom in on a portion of the first live view;  
a device tracker coupled to the camera system and to dynamically recognize new physical devices; and  
wherein the camera system can be mounted on a mobile, robotic platform.

In regards to limitation “wherein the second live view can be configured to zoom in on a portion of the first live view”, official notice is taken that zooming is a well known and widely used tool in video surveillance and conferencing systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include panning and zooming capabilities in the interactive environment taught by Emens for the benefit of allowing

videoconference participants to have access to view of any resources in the collective rooms, such as whiteboards or illustrative models.

Ayatsuka teaches a camera connected to a computer that can detect and recognize devices in the camera's view, and allows the viewed device to be controlled by the computer (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the device detection capabilities taught by Ayatsuka in the device control system taught by Emens for the benefit of allowing a user to register devices for control by a computer system without manually entering information for each device.

Burt teaches a robotic camera that detects and tracks a target (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Burt's teaching of a robotic camera that keeps targeted objects in its line of view in the interactive environment taught by Emens in view of Ayatsuka for the benefit of maintaining a view of devices that the user may want to exercise control over. Burt's abstract teaches the application of this concept to automated surveillance in the abstract.

Regarding claim 26, when read in light of claim 24, Emens further teaches the device controller can control the physical device through at least one of: 1) an infrared communication channel; and 2) one or more networks (fig. 1 col. 5 ll. 26-31).

Regarding claim 27, when read in light of claim 24, Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt further teaches the device tracker can recognize new physical devices by at least one of: 1) image pattern recognition (Burt pg. 3 col. 2 paragraph 2, fig. 2); 2) radio frequency transmission; and 3) acoustic signal.

Regarding claim 30, when read in light of claim 24, Emens further teaches the GUI is implemented as one or more web pages (col. 2 ll. 60-65).

Regarding claim 32, when read in light of claim 24, Emens further teaches the physical device has a pop-up control panel that can be made apparent to the first user through the first GUI and wherein the pop-up control panel allows the first user to control and configure the physical device (fig. 2e).

Regarding claim 34, when read in light of claim 24, both Emens and Ayatsuka teach software based control schemes for controlling objects and devices. It is inherent that the physical device can be represented by a set of attributes and a set of behaviors, as those are the only ways of representing an object to a computer program.

Regarding claim 35, when read in light of claim 34, Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt teach the shared interactive environment of claim 34.

Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt does not teach the representation of the physical device is part of a device hierarchy.

Both Emens and Ayatsuka teach software based control schemes for controlling objects and devices. Object oriented programming is an obvious approach to developing such software, as each device has its own attributes and control routines. The concept of classes and inheritance are well known and often used to create programs that support a variety of objects. Official notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use objects and inheritance to implement device control software for the benefit of optimizing the software and reducing redundancy in the application programming for devices that may share similar functions.

12. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1) in view of Ayatsuka et al (US 7,188,139 B1) and Burt et al. "Object tracking with a moving camera", IEEE An Application of Dynamic Motion Analysis. 1989 pp. 2-12, and further in view of Andersson (US 2002/0111999 A1).

Regarding claim 25, when read in light of claim 24, Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt teaches the interactive environment of claim 24 and suggests implementing device control in a video teleconferencing environment (fig. 5), but does not disclose multiple users having access to the system (i.e. the first GUI

allows the first user to interact the physical device; and wherein the interaction of the first user is apparent to a second user via a second GUI).

Andersson teaches a system that allows networked computers to access and control devices connected to any computer on that network, where both host and remote computers can monitor device events (pg. 2 sect. 0019, 0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the remote access and device monitoring capabilities taught by Andersson in the shared interactive environment taught by Emens in view of Ayatsuka for the benefit of enhancing collaboration and making a more realistic environment for users who may share resources.

13. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1) in view of Ayatsuka et al (US 7,188,139 B1) and Burt et al. “Object tracking with a moving camera”, IEEE An Application of Dynamic Motion Analysis. 1989 pp. 2-12, and further in view of Hildebrandt (US 2004/0070616).

Regarding claim 28, when read in light of claim 24, Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt teaches the interactive environment of claim 24, wherein the physical device can be a display (Ayatsuka fig. 5, col. 22 ll. 63-67). Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt does not teach the display can include an image stack.

Hildebrandt teaches an archive memory for use with an electronic whiteboard in which images associated with the whiteboard are grouped and saved. These images are stored as a stack, where the oldest image is deleted when a new image is added (see fig. 22 el 524). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store a plurality of images captured from a display for the benefit of allowing a user to continually use a display resource while still being able to access data previously represented on that display.

14. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1) in view of Ayatsuka et al (US 7,188,139 B1) and Burt et al. "Object tracking with a moving camera", IEEE An Application of Dynamic Motion Analysis. 1989 pp. 2-12, and further in view of Vetterli (US 2002/0075282).

Regarding claim 33, when read in light of claim 24, Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt teaches the shared interactive environment of claim 24.

Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt does not teach the user can annotate at least one of: 1) the first live view; and 2) the second live view.

Ayatsuka suggests one environment in which devices remotely controlled through a camera view could be used is in a teleconference (fig. 5).

Vetterli teaches a teleconference environment in which the user can annotate a live view (pg. 3 sect 0055). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the annotation abilities taught by Vetterli in the interactive environment taught by Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt for the benefit of training and guidance, and for information services, augmented reality, shopping, and meeting enhancement, as suggested by Vetterli.

15. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1) in view of Ayatsuka et al (US 7,188,139 B1) and Burt et al. "Object tracking with a moving camera", IEEE An Application of Dynamic Motion Analysis. 1989 pp. 2-12, and Andersson (US 2002/0111999 A1), and further in view of Westfield (US 6,677,979 B1).

Regarding claim 29, when read in light of claim 25, Emens in view of Ayatsuka, Burt, and Andersson teaches the shared interactive environment of claim 25.

Emens in view of Ayatsuka, Burt, and Andersson does not teach the first GUI can provide a second live view that is different from the second live view provided by the second GUI.

Ayatsuka suggests one environment in which devices remotely controlled through a camera view could be used is in a teleconference (fig. 5).

Westfield teaches a teleconference environment in which a participant can see 2 views, where the second view can be specified for each participant (abstract, fig 8b, fig 7 and col. 2 ll. 46-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the multiple views of an environment taught by Westfield in the interactive environment taught by Emens in view of Ayatsuka, Burt, and Andersson for the benefit of more closely mimicking human vision by providing both wide angle and focused views (col. 1 ll. 43-54).

16. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens et al (US 6,463,343 B1) in view of Ayatsuka et al (US 7,188,139 B1) and Burt et al. "Object tracking with a moving camera", IEEE An Application of Dynamic Motion Analysis. 1989 pp. 2-12, and further in view of Westfield (US 6,677,979 B1).

Regarding claim 31, when read in light of claim 24, Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt teaches the shared interactive environment of claim 24. Emens in view of Ayatsuka and Burt does not teach the first user can select the second live view by drawing a diagonal in the first live view. Westfield teaches a teleconference environment in which a participant can see 2 views, where the second view can be specified by a participant dragging a rectangle across the image in the first view. (abstract, fig 8b, fig 7 and col. 6 ll. 38-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

include the zoomed view of an environment taught by Westfield in the interactive environment taught by Emens in view of Ayatsuka, Burt, and Andersson for the benefit of more closely mimicking human vision by providing both wide angle and focused views (col. 1 ll. 43-54).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASMINE STOKELY-COLLINS whose telephone number is (571) 270-3459. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jasmine Stokely-Collins/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2423

/Andrew Y Koenig/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423